

LILI BOARD MEETING RECORD

23 MAY 2001

Attendance: Dawn Wittman, Marcia Beckwith, Dan Lester, Paul Holland, Ron Force, Tim Brown, Paul Krause, Charlie Bolles, Carol Silvers, Ann Joslin, Mike Samuelson, Sonja Hudson, Karen Ganske, Bruce Newell – Montana Library Network, Tom Olsen, Frank Nelson, Kay Flowers, Marj Hooper, and Jan Wall. Ruth Funabiki and Joe Reiss absent.

Welcome, Introduction:

Replacement of LiLI Board Members: Ann Joslin - Karen Ganske has agreed to be re-appointed to the LiLI Board, Marcia Beckwith has agreed to replace Carolyn Mauer who has taken increased responsibilities in her new position and will no longer be able to serve on this board. The position occupied by Joe Reiss expires in June. The original intent of this position was to represent the CIN consortium in Northern Idaho. With the merger of CIN/VALNet/INLAN, the organization is well represented by members presently on the board. There was discussion regarding the need for this position and the geographic origin of that representative.

Karen Tate of the Portneuf District Library and a representative from the Museum of Natural History were recommended as possible candidates for this position.

LiLI Board Action Plan: Ann Joslin – A copy of the existing plan was provided. The LiLI Board Action Plan addresses the different services identified by the board, some we are actively working to develop. Revisions are needed. If you see things that you would like in the plan, let us know. A draft revised plan will be distributed prior to the next meeting.

LiLI Personnel Support (Information): Ann Joslin – Prior to leaving ISL, Rand was working to get more staffing for network services. Karen Ford's position has been open for over a year and ISL has re-evaluated how those 40 hours could be best utilized. It was determined that this position will be replaced with a librarian shared between administering LiLI's electronic resources and coordinating State Library collection development. The position will go through a brief approval process and then be advertised.

We will be filling Rand's position. This individual will do much of what Rand did, troubleshooting, developing RFP's, negotiating contracts etc. This position has been posted on job-lines and list serves. Advertising has been done electronically only, as this is the type of individual we are looking for. We hope to have applications for review by June 15.

LiLI –D Survey “Common Themes”: Michael Samuelson – There were 349 responses to the survey sent out last fall. Michael developed a bullet list that was provided to the members. He also shared information with the group. He has called many of those who made comments on the survey in an attempt to assist them with their concerns.

He stated that the statistic on use of the Info Trac vs EBSCO databases were virtually the same. However, analysis of the data required interpretation as the vendors reported their statistics

somewhat differently.

Concern was expressed regarding the school librarians' comments and their need for training. A video was produced and provided to the schools instructing viewers how to use the databases. The school librarians were obviously not aware of this resource. They were also offered training in six locations by ISL staff working in conjunction with Department of Education staff. The vendors did training as well. It was felt that due to the high turn over in school personnel, the information regarding the LiLI Databases has not been transmitted to those new employees. With teachers and administrators not being reliant on the databases, new employees won't be aware of this resource. It was suggested that a training module be developed and provided on an annual basis to school librarians. Carolyn Mauer, from the Department of Education, has also expressed an interest in expanding the training on LiLI Databases with elementary schools. The workshop is prepared, it is a matter of finding the time to provide it annually. It was felt that there was a need to do training and advocacy in the school on an ongoing basis such as an annual series for new librarians. This might include not only school librarians but also teaching staff, and administrators. This could be presented at school board meetings, conferences, and administrator meetings. This might be something that this group could present rather than the State Library.

It was mentioned that the statistics for school use are misleading. Many of the schools go through a single proxy server that does not attribute usage to the individual libraries. The proxy server issue needs to be investigated. Dan Lester, from BSU, stated that BSU set up a program called JAKE. This program can be set to track usage. He offered to pursue this avenue for the LiLI Databases if there was interest. The group felt that Dan should go forward with this effort.

In most cases, school district technical staff is not familiar with the LiLI Databases. At this point those individuals consider them a drain on their technology funds, and once the databases are eliminated, those funds would return to their budgets. This might be a target group for marketing the databases.

Dr. Howard seems very committed to earmarking the \$265,000 for the LiLI Databases in the Public Schools budget. However, next year we could be facing a real crunch with state funding and there is never a guarantee that the legislature will honor the Superintendent's request. If funding were to falter, is there any estimate of the number of libraries that would be willing to kick in to cover any shortfall? The problem is, if there were a shortfall in the budget for the databases, there will be a shortfall in other state general account budgets as well.

It was stated that Albertson funds supported a group called "Tech Fellows". These individuals traveled around providing technical support to schools. Once the Albertson funds dried up, the Boise School District picked up the support of this group for the school district. This group was a great supporter of the LiLI Databases as well as good teachers and trainers. Albertson funding also supported model classrooms in five or six school districts. The thought was expressed regarding gaining Albertson support of a model library program. The School Library Coalition believes getting legislators and the Superintendent of Public Instruction into a model library in an elementary setting would help sell them on the need for library services in schools.

Bruce Newell – Montana Library Network: Presentation by Bruce Newell.

The group found it interesting what Montana was doing with digital collections. Comments were expressed regarding the Montana model in terms of the pricing structure. This is significantly different from what we have been doing with the State negotiating the contract and each library pays a portion of the total bill. It seems at some point that we may want to make a conscious decision if we are going to continue to try to get state money to fund these services, or do we want to go ahead and try to get libraries to fund parts of these projects.

The State Library does not want to get into the billing situation. However, BCR does do this sort of thing for libraries. The library develops the pricing structure and BCR does the billing and collection. The Idaho State Library might want to choose this route if we want a service bad enough.

The 20 large libraries mentioned by Bruce as carrying 75% of the bill were those with OCLC online accounts prior to the state negotiation of the contract. The remainder of the cost was divided between smaller libraries for a per library cost of approximately \$250.

Interlibrary Loan Committee Report – Kay Flowers: A revised draft of the Reciprocal Borrowing Agreement was presented to the group for review. This agreement is intended to replace all other reciprocal borrowing agreements. It makes clear that the fee charged is for lost or damaged materials and not for fees or fines. This document would establish the LiLI card and the way we borrow from each other, allowing the State Library to develop necessary procedures to put this into place.

The group discussed the need for a specific bar code for LiLI cards, the disposition of reimbursement funds, billing by ISL, training, and amount of fees, as well as replacing the fee paragraph with a statement that the fees will be negotiated annual. The document will be placed on the LiLI Web-site for review and taken back by each member of the group for their staff review. The group agreed that the next step was for Charlie to take the document to the State Library Board.

This committee voted itself out of existence.

World Cat subscription: Ann Joslin – Handout with WorldCat, First Search Base, First Search General Reference pricing. It was agreed that the State Library should go forward and start making arrangements for a 1-year subscription for WorldCat for 10 simultaneous users preceded by a trial period if possible. The OCLC contract price of \$22,600 will be paid from the \$16,000 increase in the State Library's appropriation for the Virtual Catalog and \$6,600 from the Library Services Improvement Fund. Provisions for continuation will be revisited at a later date. It was suggested that the licensing begin January 1 with a trial period prior to this time.

The State Library will also talk with OCLC about the cataloging and ILL services and the level of usage by Idaho libraries currently, with the possibility of doing something similar to the Montana model of accessing ILL and cataloging services.

Training and presentations informing libraries of what this product will provide as well as what it will not were discussed. ISL has two slots at ILA, one for networking and one for any other

issues that might arise; one could be used for promoting WorldCat.

It was asked if there would be any support for RECON. Currently LSTA funds are earmarked for libraries willing to join an existing consortium but a library can not write a project for RECON only. This encourages libraries to get up to date and get their holdings in World Cat, however many libraries can not afford the cost involved.

Courier Backbone Proposal: Ann Joslin – Ann contacted Orbis for a price quote for a 7-library backbone. They have not gotten the information from their vendor, Lanter. Two of the 7 sites are already involved in the Orbis system, so they consider this as an extension of what already exists. Currently there is a flat fee of \$425 per site per month plus a \$15 administrative fee. It was unclear if the administrative fee was a monthly or annual fee.

The request that this be funded with State funds was denied. The State Library has been discussing ways to request funds other than through its budget. In terms of moving ahead with this, it would be a self-supporting service we are discussing. Concern was expressed regarding the local funds needed to deliver locally. **This will be on the agenda for the next meeting.**

Lili Z Development – Ann Joslin – Blue Angel has new staff people who responded to our 19 change items, stating that most were completed except for the full MARC display. They responded asking how important this was, that this would cost a bit of money. This is important if users are going to use the records for cataloging. The board asked for an estimated price. So far the changes have taken 40 hours at a total of \$4,400.

Ann Joslin will work with Janet Higgins and Dan Lester to get these items reviewed and on the LiLI site in a relatively short period of time. This would then be the end of the contract until we need them again.

LiLI Board Committees: Ann Joslin – Rand suggested that the Z committee no longer had a function, but that technical advice would continue to be needed. He suggested that we could take the active ITTF members and form a technical committee. The recommendation was made to dissolve the Z committee and ITTF, and that future advice be sought from Janet Higgins and Dan Lester with their recommendations being brought to the board for decision.

LiLI – D Contract Renewal for 2002: Ann Joslin - We intend to maintain the database vendors currently on contract. Work on new bid specifications will begin this winter or early 2002. We should do some continued discussion with Montana regarding combined bidding. Dave Brunnell from BCR did some major investigation with vendors. Vendors prefer to work with individual states. However, that should not stop us from exploring the option of doing something with Montana and BCR.

Gates Training Program Grant: Ann Joslin - The Gates grants for public libraries finished up last fall. The State Library recently received information regarding an additional component to this program that offers training. The grant amount is based on the number of libraries in the state that participated in the initial Gates program. They are offering Idaho \$61,200. The goal of the grant is to promote long term sustainability of public access computing. Gard is developing

the grant application. He asked for suggestions of relevant training regarding public access training.

Putting together a network that will train the trainers would be beneficial. We should purchase training materials, conferencing software for remote training, and projection units for the field offices. Training on WorldCat and the Databases would also be helpful. Setting up a chat room sort of concept linked to the LiLI Web-site, incorporating a list of links of sites to get frequently asked questions answered, was the final suggestion.

Any other suggestions are welcome. Contact Gard at (800) 458-3271, (208) 334-2150 or ghanks@isl.state.id.us. We have until Feb. 2003 to spend the money.

LSTA Revisions: Ann Joslin –In the 2002 LSTA Guide the State Library removed the statement that by 2002 “libraries must have their bibliographic records in electronic format (USMARC21) and electronically accessible from outside the library in order to participate in grant projects.” This was a suggested requirement from ILNAC, this group’s predecessor. Idaho has not reached this level yet. State Library staff came to the conclusion that this statement would be eliminated from the allocation plan since we weren’t sure what to do with it. An attitude has been, “if libraries haven’t done their RECON by now, they’re on their own.” The other mind set is, “if we don’t offer LSTA assistance, how will they afford it?”

Topic to be discussed at future meeting. What is going to be our stance regarding RECON?

ILA Networking Program: Ann Joslin - Rand reserved two spots at ILA for presentations. One was for the LiLI Networking Board. Topics addressed might be info and training about WorldCat, best practices for ILL, LiLI Z training, or marketing. It was felt that World Cat, ILL Best Practices, and the Reciprocal Borrowing Agreement could be combined in a 1½ hour spot. We could also throw in LiLI Z. It was stated that this should be a LiLI Board program rather than one provided by the State Library.

Ann Joslin will contact Ruth Funabiki and ask if she would be willing to coordinate the ILA program for the group.

Next meeting date is Wednesday, September 5th.

Items for next meeting agenda:

- C Revised LiLI Board action plan
- C More information about OCLC ILL and cataloging services
- C Information and price quote from Orbis on courier service
- C Response from State Library Board regarding the Reciprocal Borrowing agreement
- C New networking consultant to introduce(!!)

Meeting review:



Liked one day meeting - good
It was helpful to have materials ahead of time
Presentation by Bruce interesting



Surprised it didn’t start until 9AM

Having something that shows us what other states are doing is helpful

Adjourned.